



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,124	12/11/2003	Marc Bodet	056982/00037	7890

31013 7590 11/20/2008
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

LE, THANH TAM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/20/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

klpatent@kramerlevin.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/733,124	Applicant(s) BODET ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanh-Tam T. Le	Art Unit 2839	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 12-13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muzslay (4,959,027) in view of Ogawa (5,605,475).

Regarding claim 1, Muzslay, figures 1 and 2 show a pressure-tight contact device for enabling an electrical connection to an electrical device housed in a pressure-tight housing (20), the contact device comprising an insulator (32) extending through the housing, at least one contact pin (24) extending through the insulator, a connector shell (14) of insulating material positioned on the insulator and affixed to the insulator, the connector shell including a terminal socket (40) having at least one contact tab (52) in electrical contact with the at least one contact pin, the connector shell being one of a set of interchangeable connector shells (only one shell is recited), each connector shell of said set having a different terminal socket configuration suitable for engaging a corresponding different mating connector having a corresponding mating configuration.

Muzslay discloses the claimed invention as described above except for the connector shell removably affixed to the insulator and a seal for sealing the insulator relative to the housing.

Muzslay, column 4, lines 9-18 disclose the shell and the insulator are removed from each other before deform the tines (102 and 104),(they are permanently held in place after the applicant deforms the tines). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to remove the shell from the insulator before deform the tines for the pin's inspection.

Ogawa, figure 9 shows an electrical connector having O-ring seal 30. It is obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Muzslay to have the O-ring, as taught by Ogawa, in order to create a watertight or hermetic seal therebetween.

Regarding claim 3, Muzslay discloses the electrical device housed in the housing is a motor for driving a compressor.

Regarding claim 12, Muzslay discloses the at least one contact pin is electrically connected to the electrical device and to a source of electrical current.

Regarding claim 13, Muzslay discloses the at least one contact pin is electrically connected to at least one additional electrical device disposed in the housing.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Muzslay, figure 2 shows the connector shell including a bore/a channel (74) defined for leak testing, the channel being disposed above the at least one contact tab.

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muzslay and Ogawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nakamura (6,558,178).

Muzslay and Ogawa disclose the claimed invention as described above except for a plurality of projections from at least one contact pin.

Nakamura, figure 4 shows a connecting member (41) having a plurality of lances (46). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Muzslay to have the contact having lances, as taught by Nakamura, in order to secure the contact into the insulator.

4. Claims 4-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muzslay (4,959,027) in view of Devine (7,029,327) and Ogawa (5,605,475).

Regarding claim 4, Muzslay, figures 1 and 2 show a pressure-tight contact device for enabling an electrical connection to an electrical device housed in a pressure-tight housing (20), said contact device comprising an insulator (32) extending through said housing, at least one contact pin (24) extending through said insulator, a connector shell of insulating material (14) positioned on said insulator, said connector shell including a shroud (40), at least one contact tab (54) disposed in said connector shell, said at least one contact pin elastically and electrically connected to said at least one contact tab, and at least one fastener (102, figure 2) for affixing said connector shell to said insulator, said at least one contact tab and said shroud forming said terminal socket for mating with a connector member of said connecting cable.

Muzslay discloses the claimed invention as described above except for the connector shell removably affixed to the insulator, a first O-ring seal for sealing said insulator relative to said housing, a second O-ring seal for sealing said at least one contact pin relative to said insulator, and a third O-ring for sealing said connector shell relative to said insulator.

Muzslay, column 4, lines 9-18 disclose the shell and the insulator are removed from each other before deform the tines (102 and 104),(they are permanently held in place after the applicant deforms the tines). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to remove the shell from the insulator before deform the tines for the pin's inspection.

Devine, figure 3 shows a watertight device having O-ring sealing members 154 and 158 read as first and second O-ring seals, respectively.

Ogawa, figure 9 shows an electrical connector having O-ring seal 30 reads as a third O-ring seal.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Muzslay to have the O-ring seals, as taught by Devine and Ogawa, in order to create a watertight or hermetic seal therebetween (Devine, column 3, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 5, Muzslay, figures 2 and 6 show said at least one contact pin includes at least one tip (not labeled) arranged and constructed to engage at least one opening (64) defined in said at least one contact tab (figure 6).

Regarding claim 6, Muzslay, figure 2 shows said at least one contact tab includes at least one contact face defined by said at least one opening, said at least one contact face bearing against said at least one contact pin to provide an electrical connection between said at least one contact pin and said at least one contact tab.

Regarding claim 7, Muzslay, figure 2 shows said at least one contact pin and said at least one contact tab are positioned proximate one another.

Regarding claim 11, Muzslay, figure 2 shows said at least one fastener is a play-free snap fastener.

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muzslay (4,959,027) in view of Devine (7,029,327) and Ogawa (5,605,475) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Cady (5,295,863).

Muzsly, Devine and Ogawa disclose the claimed invention as described above except for nose members for positioning said at least one contact tab in said connector shell and the at least one contact tab is held in position in said connector shell by means of a crimp.

Cady, figures 2 and 3 show an electrical connector having a conductive pin (40) having a flared portion (52) would reads as nose members. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to crimp the conductive pin to have the flared portion, as taught by Cady, in order to provide a friction fit into a bore (Cady, column 5, lines 45-49).

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muzslay (4,959,027) in view of Devine (7,029,327) and Ogawa (5,605,475) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Klemen (5,511,990).

Muzsly, Devine and Ogawa disclose the claimed invention as described above except for the at least one fastener is a bolt.

Klemen, figure 2 show a connector assembly having screw (22) that secure the retainer plate 20 to the receptacle 14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Muzslay to have

Art Unit: 2839

the screw, as taught by Klemen, in order to have more security between the shell and the insulator.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/15/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 9, Applicant argues "Muzslay nowhere teaches or suggests a removable connector shell that is one of a set of interchangeable connector shells having different configurations suitable for engaging various corresponding mating connectors having corresponding mating configurations". The Examiner disagrees. Muzslay, column 4, lines 9-18 disclose the shell and the insulator are removed from each other before deform the tines (102 and 104) and they are permanently held in place after the applicant deforms the tines. The connector shell and the insulator are two separate pieces, although they are permanently held in place but they still can take away for some reasons, for the pin's inspection. Just only one connector shell is recited in the claims, not a set of interchangeable connector shells; therefore, the limitations above are readable as calling for selection of the shell from among a set of different type connector shells and such limitations do not define over the Muzslay single shell fixed onto his device.

For the above, it is believed that the rejections of other dependent claims should be sustained.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh-Tam T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-2094. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TC Patel can be reached on 571-272-2098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2839

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thanh-Tam T. Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2839.
11/17/08.